APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/648,612	08/28/2000	Hayaki Matsui	ASA-923	5524

7590   07/16/2002

Mattingly Stanger & Malur PC
Attorneys at Law
104 East Hume Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22301

EXAMINER
MCCARTNEY, LINZY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2671	

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 August 2000_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-8_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-8_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _28 August 2000_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☒ None of:

        1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _4_ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1.   Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Japan on October 6, 1999. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the Japanese application (Application No. 11-285331) as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,334,117 to Covert et al. (henceforth referred to as Covert) in view of Powell, *HTML: The Complete Reference* (henceforth referred to as Powell).

a.   Referring to claim 1, Covert discloses "an information processing unit by sequentially changing a series of image contents to display images on the screen" (column 7, lines 8-18 and Abstract). The apparatus disclosed by Covert utilizes a "browser" for HTML document handling (column 8, lines 28-39). Covert does not explicitly disclose "generating separately image content information describing image content to display on said information unit and screen transition process information describing an screen transition process to deal with said series of image contents", "forming an image displayed on said information

processing unit by a parent frame and two child frames included in said parent frame", "storing said image content information in one child frame and said screen transition process information in the other child frame" or "sequentially changing said series of image contents to display the images based on said screen transition process information". However, Powell discloses "generating separately image content information describing image content to display on said information unit and screen transition process information describing an screen transition process to deal with said series of image contents" ("For example, one frame can contain links..."--page 1, paragraph 1 "Frames provide layout facilities and, potentially navigation" --page 2, paragraph 1, and Figure 9-1, page 1), "forming an image displayed on said information processing unit by a parent frame and two child frames included in said parent frame" (Figure 9-1, page 1), "storing said image content information in one child frame and said screen transition process information in the other child frame" (Figure 9-1, page 1), "sequentially changing said series of image contents to display the images based on said screen transition process information" ("For example, one frame can contain links..."--page 1, paragraph 1 and "Frames provide layout facilities and, potentially navigation" --page 2, paragraph 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of Covert with the teachings of Powell because incorporating frames allows the user to view information in one frame while keeping another frame open for reference instead of moving back and forth between pages and the

contents of one frame can be manipulated, or linked to another frames allowing the construction of more sophisticated interfaces (Powell, page 1, paragraph 1).

b.   Referring to claim 2, Covert discloses "image content information includes information about the message display area for displaying specified messages and information about an item selection image for the user to select an optional item from a plurality of items in accordance with said displayed image, and wherein when the user selects an image of an item and an event occurs a transition takes place to any of said series of image contents." (column 17, lines 7-19).

c.   Referring to claim 3, Covert as modified discloses the image control method except "the other frame for storing said screen transition process information is set to size "0". The disclosure of Powell meets the recited limitation (Chapter 8, page 4, Figure 8-1).

3.   Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Covert in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,041,967 to Ephrath et al. (henceforth referred to as Ephrath).

Covert discloses "an screen transition method for executing an screen transition process in an information processing unit for sequentially changing a series of image contents to display images on the screen by the images" (column 11, lines 46-66). Covert does not explicitly disclose "describing in table form the processing items in the screen transition process, said screen transition process changing current image to the next one at the end of display of each individual image content of said series of image contents", "sequentially reading the processing items described in table form and carrying out said transition process of said series of image contents". Ephrath discloses "describing in table

form the processing items in the screen transition process, said screen transition process

changing current image to the next one at the end of display of each individual image

content of said series of image contents" (Figure 4) and "sequentially reading the

processing items described in table form and carrying out said transition process of said

series of image contents" (column 5, lines 37-47 and Fig 5). It would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

disclosure of Covert with the teachings of Ephrath because it allows the addition or

deletion of system capabilities to be immediately reflected in the menu system and it

allows non-expert users, using standard editing tool to customize the menu (Ephrath,

column 2, lines 28-38).

4.   Claims 5,7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Covert in view of Ephrath as applied to claim 4 above and further in view of Kottler et al.

Microsoft Visual InterDev Unleashed.

      a.   Referring to claim 5, the modified disclosure of Covert discloses "an

      screen transition method for executing an screen transition process in an

      information processing unit for sequentially changing a series of image contents

      to display images on the screen" (Covert, column 7, lines 8-18 and Abstract),

      "generating content parts, each showing processing units in the screen transition

      process and a manager sheet describing events in the content parts in table form"

      (Ephrath, Figure 4) and "generating a controller sheet describing the processing

      items in the screen transitions in said content parts in table form" (Ephrath ,

      Figure 4), but does not explicitly disclose "sequentially reading the processing

      items described in said manager sheet and generating a manager to control the

flow of a series of processes corresponding to the read processing items",

"sequentially reading the processing items described in said controller sheet and

generating a controller to decide the next image corresponding to the read

processing item" or "operating said controller according to said manager to

change the image". Kottler discloses *active server pages*, HTML files that have

additional server-side commands (scripts) stored in the file (page 1, paragraph 4).

Kottler discloses that server-side functions are parsed out of the ASP file,

executed, and HTML containing information for display are sent to the browser

for display (page 1, paragraph 6 – page 2, paragraph 1). It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to further modify the teaching of Covert with the disclosure of Kottler because it

would allow the creation of server generated (dynamic) web pages (Kottler, page

1, paragraph 1).

b. Referring to claim 7, the modified disclosure of Covert discloses "an

screen transition method for executing an screen transition process in an

information processing unit for sequentially changing a series of image contents

to display images on the screen" (Covert, column 7, lines 8-18 and Abstract), but

does not explicitly disclose "storing in a file sheet describing the processing items

of the screen transition process in table form and an screen transition program

generator wherein said screen transition program generator sequentially reads the

processing items from said sheet, sequentially writes the in the file the necessary

program descriptions corresponding to the read processing items and generates an

screen transition program on the file". Kottler discloses *active server pages*,

HTML files that have additional server-side commands (scripts) stored in the file (page 1, paragraph 4). Active server pages utilize scripts that are parsed out of the ASP file by the Web server and executed. Then HTML is sent back to the browser for display (page 1, paragraph 6 – page 2, paragraph 1). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the teachings of Covert with the disclosure of Kottler because it would allow the creation of server generated (dynamic) web pages (Kottler, page 1, paragraph 1).

    c.   Claim 8 is rejected with the rationale of the rejections of claims 5 and 7.

5.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Covert in view of Ephrath as applied to claim 5 above and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,872,565 to Greaves et al. (henceforth referred to as Greaves). The modified disclosure of Covert discloses the screen transition system except for " a plurality of unit-of-processing component parts, each having a unit-of-processing image storage containing a series of image contents for each specified unit-of-processing, and a controller, connected to said unit-of-processing image storage, for deciding the next screen transition" and "manager, connected to said plurality of unit-of-processing component parts, for controlling the flow of one unit of processing". However, Greaves discloses a system that meets the aforementioned limitations (Figs 1 and 2). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to further modify the teachings of Covert with the disclosure of Greaves because it would facilitate real-time video processing on a single integrated system (Greaves, column 1, lines 65-67 and column 2, lines 53-57).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Linzy McCartney** whose telephone number is **(703) 605-0745**. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday (8:00AM-5: 30PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Mark Zimmerman**, can be reached at **(703) 305-9798**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

ltm
June 14, 2002